Docket No. 103-1002

Appl. No. 10/749,394

Amdt. Dated June 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2006

<u>REMARKS</u>

Introduction

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 11-19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant also notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that each of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of January 2, 2004 have been considered.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-6, 10-19 and 28 are pending in the application. Claims 6-9 and 20-27 have been withdrawn. Claims 29 and 30 have been cancelled. Claim 28 has been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

Objections

Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification due to informalities. Paragraph 19 has been amended to replace "code" with "cord." It is respectfully submitted that the amendment to paragraph 19 has obviated the objection.

Rejection under 35 USC §112

Claims 28-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

The relevant portion of independent claim 28 has been amended to recite, among other things, "a body having a first end to receive the charging current." Thus, independent claim 28 has been amended to specify that the conductive material has first and second ends.

Applicants submit that independent claim 28 particularly points out Applicant's invention, that the conductive material conducts the charging current. Further, the contact plate is "electrically

Docket No. 103-1002 Appl. No. 10/749,394

Amdt. Dated June 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2006

connected to a second end of the conductive material to be brought into electrical contact with a corresponding one of the contact terminals of the mobile robot," as recited in independent claim 28. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 28 has been overcome and the rejections should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner fails to address the Applicant's body and head movably connected to the body.

Rejection under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-5, 10 and 28 is rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by <u>Yoshikawa</u> (U.S. 5,892,350). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

With regard to the Office Action, the Examiner takes the position that <u>Yoshikawa</u> discloses "[e]ach of the charging terminals comprising: a body and a head (Fig. 4A, element 18) of the mobile robot (Fig. 4A)." See Office Action of March 27, 2006, page 4.

The Examiner fails to address the Applicants' body and head movably connected to the body. It is respectfully submitted that Yoshikawa does not disclose "a body, and a head movably coupled to the body," as recited in independent claim 1. One the fourth page, third paragraph of the Office Action of March 27, 2006, the Examiner appears to refer to the element 18 of Yoshikawa as Applicants' body and head. However, Yoshikawa discloses in FIGS. 4A and 4B and Col. 3, line 51 and Col. 5, lines 1-15 that element 18 denotes a stationary electrode. In fact, Yoshikawa discloses that arm member 80 and 81 or magnetic iron cores 100 to guide the robot to the recharging area to contact the stationary electrodes 18, that stationary electrodes 18 are provided with a pair of coil springs 18a fixed to the support plate 20 and that "electric power sources 60 for the charge are provided in the charging unit 32, and both terminals of each electric power source 60 are respectively connected to the stationary electrodes of each pair of coil springs 18a." It is respectfully submitted that the stationary electrode of Yoshikawa does not correspond to the Applicants' body, nor Applicants' head movably connected to the body.

Docket No. 103-1002 Appl. No. 10/749,394 Amdt. Dated June 21, 2006 Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2006

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the...claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). "The elements must be arranged as required by the claim..." In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Accordingly, Yoshikawa fails to disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, since Independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Yoshikawa, Independent claim 1 is allowable over Yoshikawa, and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Regarding claims 2-5, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reason that each of claim 2-5 depend from independent claim 1, and therefore contain all of the features recited in independent claim 1, these claims are also patentable over <u>Yoshikawa</u>. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims are also earnestly solicited.

Claim 10

With regard to independent claim 10, the Examiner takes the position that <u>Yoshikawa</u> discloses "a head and a contact (Fig. 3, element 58), and electrically connected ... to the charging circuit." See Office Action, page 5.

The Examiner fails to address the Applicants' head movably coupled to the second support member. It is respectfully submitted that <u>Yoshikawa</u> does not disclose "a body having a first support member to be inserted into the guide groove, and having a second support member extending from the first support member to protrude from the terminal mounting board, and a head movably coupled to the second support member of the body, having a contact plate" as recited in independent claim 10. The Examiner appears to refer to the element 18 of <u>Yoshikawa</u> as Applicants' body and head. However, <u>Yoshikawa</u> discloses in FIGS. 4A and 4B and Col. 3, line 51 and Col. 5, lines 1-15 that element 18 denotes a stationary electrode. In fact, <u>Yoshikawa</u> discloses that arm member 80 and 81 or magnetic iron cores 100 to guide the robot to the recharging area to contact the stationary electrodes 18, that stationary electrodes 18 are provided with a pair of coil springs 18a fixed to the support plate 20 and that "electric power

Docket No. 103-1002 Appl. No. 10/749,394 Amdt. Dated June 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2006

sources 60 for the charge are provided in the charging unit 32, and both terminals of each electric power source 60 are respectively connected to the stationary electrodes of each pair of coil springs 18a." It is respectfully submitted that the stationary electrode of <u>Yoshikawa</u> does not correspond to the Applicants' body, nor Applicants' head movably connected to the body.

As described above, <u>Yoshikawa</u> fails to disclose every element as presently recited in independent claim 10. Since Independent claim 10 is patentably distinguishable from <u>Yoshikawa</u>, Independent claim 10 is allowable over <u>Yoshikawa</u>, and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claim 28

Claim 28 has been amended to recite, among other things, "respective heads of the charging terminals are bent with respect to corresponding ones of bodies or the charging terminals in different directions when the contact terminals of the mobile robot contact corresponding ones of the charging terminals of the charging unit in a direction having an angle with a direction disposed on a line passing through a center of the mobile robot," "and "the contact terminals are disposed in a circular direction about a center of the mobile robot."

Applicant's respectfully submit that <u>Yoshikawa</u> does not disclose that that the respective heads of the elements 18 are bent with respect to corresponding ones of bodies of the charging electrodes 56 and 57 in different directions. <u>Yoshikawa</u> discloses in FIGS. 4A and 4B and Col. 3, line 51 and Col. 5, lines 1-15 that element 18 denotes a stationary electrode. In fact, <u>Yoshikawa</u> discloses that arm member 80 and 81 or magnetic iron cores 100 to guide the robot to the recharging area to contact the stationary electrodes 18, that stationary electrodes 18 are provided with a pair of coil springs 18a fixed to the support plate 20 and that "electric power sources 60 for the charge are provided in the charging unit 32, and both terminals of each electric power source 60 are respectively connected to the stationary electrodes of each pair of coil springs 18a." Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 28 is allowable over <u>Yoshikawa</u>.

Accordingly, allowance of this claim and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Docket No. 103-1002 Appl. No. 10/749,394

Amdt. Dated June 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2006

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to out Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLF

Registration No. 52,918

Joseph P. Hrutka

Dated:

June 21, 2006

919 18th St., NW, Suite 440

Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: (202) 775-1900

Facsimile: (202) 775-1901